



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/629,698      | 07/30/2003  | Mark William Vernon  |                     | 8719             |

7590 10/06/2006

Paul D. Gornall,  
Barrister & Solicitor; Reg'd Patent & TM Agent  
1820-355 Burrard St.  
Vancouver, BC V6C 2G8  
CANADA

EXAMINER

HENN, TIMOTHY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/629,698

Applicant(s)

VERNON, MARK WILLIAM

Examiner

Timothy J. Henn

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 7-14 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7-9, 13, 14 and 18-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The inclusion of a written opinion and references is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. Claim 1 recites the limitation of a "light source's heavy components, comprising a power supply and a heatsink", however as written it is not clear that the "comprising a power supply and a heatsink" limitation is defining the light source's heavy components or if the limitation is defining the fibre optic illuminator described in the preamble of the claim. For the purposes of art rejection, the limitation from claim 1 will be read as defining the light source's heavy components.
  - b. Claim 8 currently depends on "Claim 4 7", for the purposes of rejection, the examiner will consider claim 8 to depend on claim 7.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US 4,855,838).

**[claim 2]**

Regarding claim 2, Jones discloses a surveillance speed dome camera with an illumination source which is designed to inspect pipes (Figure 1; c. 11, ll. 46-65). Jones further discloses that a goal of his invention is to create a camera which is extremely small (e.g. c. 2, ll. 7-11). Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to use external light sources coupled to fiber optic light transmission cables placed inside and coupled to a camera head to provide a small light source for camera heads which are designed to inspect/survey the interior of inaccessible places such as small pipes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a an external light source and fiber optic cable to provide a light source for the speed dome camera of Jones to reduce the size of the camera to allow smaller pipes to be inspected. The examiner notes that a power source and heat sink are inherent components of a light source.

Art Unit: 2622

5. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US 4,855,838) in view of Dorsey (US 4,398,791).

**[claim 10]**

Regarding claim 10, Jones does not disclose an optical slip ring to couple the light source and the surveillance speed dome. Dorsey discloses an optical slip ring which allows a fiber optic cable to rotate with respect to its source (Figure 1; c. 1, ll. 9-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an optical slip ring assembly in the system of Jones to allow the fiber optic cable to freely rotate.

**[claim 11]**

Regarding claim 11, Dorsey discloses an optical slip right which aligns an open end of two fiber optic cables together within a sealed joint housing such that the beam from a light source can travel across a small air space from the open end of the first cable to the open end of the second cable (Figures 1 and 2). The examiner notes that the light which travels to the second optic cable would inherently disperse to illuminate a desired area once it leaves the second cable.

**[claim 12]**

Regarding claim 12, Dorsey discloses an optical slip ring which aligns the open end of the fiber optic cable with the rotatably opposing end of the fiber optic cable within the sealed joint housing such that the center of the fiber optic cable is aligned with an axis of rotation of the opposing open end with respect to the open end.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 13, 14 and 18-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**[claims 3, 4 and 18-21]**

Regarding claims 3, 4, and 18-21, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a speed dome surveillance system as claimed wherein the light source's power supply and heat sink are mounted in a base for a support for the surveillance speed dome.

**[claims 7-9]**

Regarding claims 7-9, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a speed dome surveillance system in which a beam of light from a light source is carried via a fiber optic cable to provide illumination from within the dome and an illuminator dispersing lens is mounted on a motorized sub carriage by which the position of the illuminator dispersing lens can be changed with respect to the fiber optic cable outlet to change an angle of dispersion of illumination. While the use of dispersion lenses is known in the art, the claimed structure is not.

**[claim 13]**

Regarding claim 13, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a speed dome surveillance system including an optical slip ring which is surrounded by multiple electrical slip rings and brushes to provide low level power for a video signal and power for the surveillance camera from a stationary support to a rotating carriage on which the

Art Unit: 2622

surveillance camera is mounted within the dome.

**[claim 14]**

Regarding claim 14, the prior art does not or fairly suggest a surveillance speed dome system in which a beam from the light source is pulsed and the surveillance camera is synchronized such that it does not collect light until just after the time period required for each pulse of the beam from the light source to be emitted from the fiber optic cable outlet and to bounce back to the surveillance camera from an inside surface of the speed dome, but does not collect light thereafter until the time required to the beam from the light source to be reflected from a target area back to the surveillance camera.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following is considered relevant to surveillance systems with illumination:


|      |                  |              |
|------|------------------|--------------|
| i.   | Tranchita et al. | US 5,793,730 |
| ii.  | Moore et al.     | US 5,195,392 |
| iii. | Thompson         | US 6,577,339 |
| iv.  | Coan et al.      | US 6,091,453 |
| v.   | Lewis et al.     | US 4,492,427 |
| vi.  | Sakiyama et al.  | US 5,140,265 |

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy J. Henn whose telephone number is (571) 272-7310. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TJH  
9/30/2006



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600